DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 670 TE 001 480

By-Peterson, Erling W.

A Study of the Effects Upon the Teaching Effectiveness of English Teachers of the Organization of the Literature Component of Teacher-Training Curricula. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-28p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
Descriptors-Course Content, Course Evaluation, *Course Organization, Curriculum Evaluation, English Curriculum, English Education, *English Instruction, Literary Genres, Literary History, *Literature, Literature Programs, Secondary Education, *Teacher Education, Teaching Methods, Teaching Models, Teaching Procedures, *Teaching Skills
Identifiers-Project English

This ISCPET study set out to determine the effect that various approaches to teaching literature to prospective high school English teachers might have on their literary knowledge and later teaching competencies. The curricular patterns used to teach literature at three colleges--survey approach (University of Illinois), author and historical period approach (Bradley University), and genre approach (North Central College)--were compared with the teaching competencies of a group of first-year graduates, from each of the schools, who were teaching secondary school literature. No definitive statistical evidence was produced to indicate that any one of the three approaches was superior in conveying literary knowledge. Some significant statistical support was found, however, for the contention that, for developing teaching competencies as judged by secondary school department chairmen and critic teachers, a genre approach to teaching literature proved more effective in preparing students to teach literature than did the historical period or survey approaches. (Author/JB)

EDO 30670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-13-11-66

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

A Study of the Effects Upon the Teaching Effectiveness of English Teachers of the Organization of the Literature Component of Teacher-Training Curricula

Erling W. Peterson
North Central College
Naperville, Illinois

June 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 001 480

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Summary	1
II.	Introduction	2
III.	Method	6
IV.	Results	9
	Table 1: Comparison of Statistical Data of English Majors Entering Teaching	10
	Table 2: Appraisal of Teacher Competence in the Area of Literature--Appraisal of Practice Teachers	11
	Table 3: Appraisal of Teacher Competence in the Area of Literature--Appraisal of First-Year Teachers	12
	Table 4: Self-Appraisal of Teacher Preparation in the Area of Literature--Appraisal by Practice Teachers	14
	Table 5: Self-Appraisal of Teacher Preparation in the Area of Literature--Appraisal by First-Year Teachers	15
V.	Discussion	16
VI.	Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations	18
VII.	References	19
	Appendix A: Study Record Sheet	20
	Appendix B: Appraisal of Teacher Competence in the Area of Literature	21
	Appendix C: Teacher's Self-Appraisal of College Preparation in Area of Literature	25

SUMMARY

The general aim of this study was to evaluate the relative effectiveness of various curricular approaches, historical period, survey, and genre, with respect to the preparation of prospective high school English teachers. It sought, specifically, to answer two related questions:

a. What is the effect of a college's particular approach to the teaching of literature upon its graduates' competence in the teaching of high school literature?
b. What is the effect of a college's particular approach to the teaching of literature upon the literary knowledge of graduates of that college?

In answering the first question, some significant statistical support was found for the assertion that a genre approach to the teaching of literature was more effective than either historical period studies or survey approaches in preparing teachers of English, at least insofar as the effectiveness of such teachers was appraised by department chairmen and supervising teachers in the schools.

In answering the second question, no definitive statistical evidence was found to support a direct claim for superiority of any of the three curricular approaches over another.

Shortcomings of the study were the problems of securing statistics from the schools and from graduates of the institutions cooperating in the study. Consequently, small populations are involved in the statistical analyses.

INTRODUCTION

When the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET) began its work with the twenty cooperating institutions, North Central College was pleased to be asked to participate in the program. In 1957-1958, North Central College had carried out a revamping of its program in English resulting in a genre approach to the teaching of the subject. Participation in ISCPET made possible a study[1] which reported the effects of this curricular change upon those who became teachers in the public schools.

Deficiencies in the procedures and in the measuring instruments and techniques became apparent as the investigation into teacher effectiveness of North Central College graduates was conducted. Despite these difficulties, the Executive Committee of ISCPET saw possibilities in the North Central program for larger usefulness in the total ISCPET program. As the various schools began their work on aspects of the college training of secondary school English teachers, one area was relatively untouched--the effect of any particular curricular pattern upon teacher effectiveness. With the first North Central study as somewhat of a pilot program, the investigator proposed a more comprehensive study of the effect of curricular arrangements upon teacher effectiveness in the teaching of literature.

Cooperation of other ISCPET schools with different curricular arrangements for the teaching of literature was solicited and Loyola University, Bradley University, Illinois Wesleyan University, Monmouth College, and the University of Illinois volunteered to participate in the study which was to be headquartered at North Central College and directed by Erling W. Peterson. With the experience gained in studying North Central's curricular revision, the investigator designed instruments to evaluate teacher effectiveness which were distributed to the participating schools. The gathering of the relevant data began.

The problem of arrangement of the literature component of the English curriculum in terms of any theory has seldom been dealt with in the relevant articles or books. In most colleges and universities, as in most treatments of the subject, an historical arrangement of the study of English has been accepted without much more than an assumption that such is the way things ought to be. Some writers have presented arguments for the historical arrangement of the curriculum,

of course. Pearce[2] said,

> We have accepted the fact that the means to studying our literature in its historical development must be integrally related to the more general study of our history...

and he adds,

> What is the nature of this integrally compounded literary history and historical criticism which we so badly need? What sort of teaching and study would it produce?
>
> I suggest that it is a history and criticism whose method must be such as to keep in view the fact...that literature--any literature--is at once in history and above it...as a crucial dimension of culture is history, so it is of literature.

Lewis and Sisk[3] suggested sound historical reason for such orientation of curriculum in English departments. It was not, they said, until the middle nineteenth century that English literature as such was studied in colleges and universities, and even after courses in such insubstantial matters as literature were instituted, they were concerned more with literary history than with the works themselves. And it was well on into the twentieth century before American literature became an accepted area of study, even in American universities. Lewis and Sisk quoted Augustus Edward Freeman,[4] Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford, who in the 1880's uttered what was for then the definitive word about literature, and what has remained as an assumption for literary study:

> There are many things fit for a man's personal study which are not fit for university examinations. One of them is "literature" in the Lecturer's sense. He (the correspondent) tells us that it "cultivates the taste, educates the sympathies, enlarges the mind." Excellent results against which no one has a word to say. Only we cannot examine in tastes and sympathies. The examiner, in any branch of knowledge, must stick to the duller range of..."technical and positive information..."

While most college English departments would protest that they offer more than "the duller range" of subjects in their teaching today, it remains true that an historical arrangement of courses, beginning with Old English and progressing through Renaissance, Elizabethan, Augustan, Romantic,

Victorian, and "contemporary" periods is a widely accepted pattern for English curricula.

In the 1920's and the 1930's much use was made of surveys of teaching practices in the secondary schools of America to urge curricular reforms in the direction of correlation of practice in the school with "life experiences" of the students once they completed their schooling. Louise Rosenblatt's Literature As Exploration[5] put it succinctly:

> Literary history has its values...yet those values should not be permitted to obscure the fact that all the student's knowledge about literary history, about authors, periods, literary types, will be so much useless baggage if the student has not been led primarily to seek from literature a vital personal experience.

Life-centered, problem-centered, issue-oriented high school programs were encouraged, particularly in English. Reflections of this attitude toward the teaching of English were seen in attempts to model college freshman courses on a "communications" pattern, but the large part of the course structure in the English departments resisted such innovations. By and large, this approach to curriculum patterning had little effect at the college level. The general ferment created by this questioning of traditional historical patterns, however, did lead to some re-thinking among English scholars and did result in some suggestions for curricular reform, largely in the direction of what is known as the "genre" approach.

Wellek and Warren,[6] in 1942, sought to find a path between the older, established historical pattern of study and the pressures put upon English departments to become "relevant," with few or no objective standards for literature, and with a pattern of simply encouraging students to "enjoy" literature and apply it wherever possible to daily existence. They pointed out that, "personal 'intuition' may lead to a merely emotional 'appreciation', to complete subjectivity," and, of course, that identifying "scientific and historical method...leads either to the mere collection of facts or to the establishment of highly generalized historical laws." The data they proposed were those which led to the study of what they called "imaginative literature," further defined as areas such as poetry, the novel, and the drama. They sought to draw distinctions between every-day speech, scientific writings, and "literature," asserting the validity of an approach to the study of English which assigns a distinctive quality to imaginative writings which can be identified and taught, in opposition to Freeman's support of "the duller range," as limiting the English curriculum. As Spiller

pointed out much later (1963), "some works of art are 'good' and some are not so good, and...their importance in literary history per se depends on some kind of judgment in these terms."

Perhaps the fact that Spiller,[7] a generation after Wellek and Warren, could present a paper at the annual NCTE meeting with the title, "Is Literary History Obsolete?" and the fact that Crane, writing ten years before Wellek and Warren in College English, titled his presentation "History vs Criticism in the Study of Literature"[8] indicates some trend in thinking among educators in English. The historical arrangement of the curriculum has not been unchallenged. However, those who have supported other curricular patterns than historical period study have not been so numerous nor so influential as to bring about large-scale changes. While no survey of college catalogs or college English departments was made for this study, it is perhaps safe to venture the opinion that a large majority of college English departments are still dealing with literature in terms of survey or historical period studies. And, of course, within this curricular pattern much attention undoubtedly is given to analysis of works of art per se. As Wellek and Warren went to some length to point out, it is difficult indeed to treat literature purely as art, purely as historical data, purely as material for analysis. There has been, and probably always will be, overlapping of methods.

Nevertheless, it was the concern of this study to determine whether or not it was possible to determine the effect of a particular curricular pattern at the college level upon the graduate who began his teaching career at the junior or senior high school level. Following is an account of the methods and procedures used to test the assertion, stated as a null hypothesis, that there is no significant difference in ability to teach literature as observed by critic teachers and supervisors and/or as measured by tests or grade performances among teachers prepared by curricula arranged by historical period or survey or genre.

METHOD

In order to test the hypothesis of this study, cooperation was sought from schools in ISCPET whose curricular patterns would facilitate comparison of historical, survey, and genre approaches to the study of literature. The original group of schools volunteering included Bradley University, Illinois Wesleyan University, Loyola University, Monmouth College, North Central College, and the University of Illinois. Because of problems which developed in the schools and in the securing of various data, Monmouth College and Illinois Wesleyan University dropped out of the study.

In analyzing the curricular arrangements at the schools involved, three patterns emerged. At the University of Illinois, emphasis was upon the survey of literature plus some study of individual authors and periods. Bradley University emphasized a basically historical period approach. At Loyola University, the principal emphasis was historical. North Central College treated literature in genre courses with the exception of a single survey course at the sophomore level.

Once the basic outline of the North Central College proposal had been approved by the Executive Committee of ISCPET, meetings of representatives of the schools involved were held. It was agreed that a common form for compilation of data would be employed (see Appendix A) and that each school would secure data for its own graduates. Cooperating in the gathering of data were Joseph L. Wolff of Loyola University, William L. Gillis and later June Snider of Bradley University, and Paul H. Jacobs of the University of Illinois.

Evaluative instruments, as noted earlier, were not available for the specific information desired for the study. Consultation with J. N. Hook, William Evans, and Paul H. Jacobs of the ISCPET staff and examination of numbers of evaluation forms from a variety of sources led to the decision to develop forms which would elicit the data needed. The director of the study developed a teacher evaluation form for use by supervising teachers and/or principals, and this form, after discussion and consultation with the cooperating schools, was revised and used as the basic evaluating device. (Appendix B) In addition, a student or teacher self-appraisal form, developed for use in the earlier North Central College study, was utilized by each school. (Appendix C)

After the forms were adopted, the procedures for gathering data were instituted. These consisted of three principal operations:

(1) The Educational Testing Service National Teachers Examination in Language and Literature was to be administered at each school to all sophomore English majors in the fall of the year and to all graduating seniors in the spring. (This procedure was already a part of one of ISCPET's total evaluation programs at all twenty cooperating institutions.) The schools in the comparative curriculum study were also to administer the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Tests.

(2) Each school in the North Central College curriculum study was to secure information on its own students from school files in order to establish bases for comparison with the other schools. This information included high school graduating class rank, ACT or SAT scores, college graduating class rank, grade point average, hours of English and English course grade point average.

(3) Each cooperating school was to send out the necessary appraisal forms to critic teachers for students doing practice teaching under those teachers and to supervisors or English department heads for their graduates in their first year of teaching. They were also to secure appraisal forms from each student teacher and from each first-year graduate teaching in the schools. These forms would indicate the reaction of the teachers themselves to the preparation their college had given them to teach literature.

Problems soon developed in the carrying out of this three-fold program. The original plan of the study called for testing of all sophomores declaring an English major early in the sophomore year, using the ETS English Language and Literature test of the National Teacher Examination Battery, and readministering the test to those same English majors in their final semester of college to provide a relatively objective measure of gain in competence under the three different programs. Unfortunately, due to problems of identification of majors at the various schools, transfers who arrived after the first semester of the sophomore year, and late decisions of students in declaring an English major, this point of the program had to be abandoned. Data could not be secured.

In the original plan, it was proposed that evaluation of graduates would take place after one and two years of teaching. The evaluation after two years of teaching proved impossible to accomplish. Instead, it was decided by the representatives of the institutions involved that an evaluation of student teachers by their critic teachers and a self-appraisal by the student teachers would be added to the original plan and could be most useful, since the critic or

supervising teachers would probably have more opportunity for evaluation of a student who was teaching than would department chairmen in a school system after the student had graduated from college.

Because of the amount of information which was sought, it was exceedingly difficult to secure complete records on a number of students, but with the modifications already outlined, compilation of the data proceeded. Then, once the data were compiled, they were tabulated for ready comparison using a t-test as the basic statistical method. These results are reported in the succeeding section of this report.

RESULTS

Despite the exceedingly difficult task of securing cooperation from so many different sources of information, in the areas of investigation sufficient data were secured to give some indication of the answers that might be offered to the hypothesis of the study. Statistics were tabulated for the four schools in two ways: overall measures as established on the project record forms; and item by item analyses of the appraisals by teachers and by students of the effectiveness of the college program in preparing teachers of literature.

Table 1, the overall statistics, reveals that, on the whole, English teachers in the four schools tended to come from the upper quarter, even the upper 10%, of high school graduating classes. This reflected, of course, the selective nature of admissions at all four schools involved, but it also indicated the relatively high quality of students going into the field of English teaching. The total figures were somewhat misleading since obviously the University of Illinois, Loyola University, and Bradley University had many more students than are represented in this report. The sample, however, was composed of those for whom statistical information was relatively complete. This drastically limited the numbers except at North Central College, where the final total represented approximately half of the total number of graduates who entered teaching or planned to.

Further examination of Table 1 indicates that those who entered the field of English maintained a relatively high grade point, in each case about a B average, and usually, as might be expected, attained slightly better grades in English than in their overall college program.

Table 2 presents the information from critic or supervising teachers of students doing practice teaching in their senior year of college, and Table 3 presents the information from department chairmen or principals of first-year teachers. Loyola University was not represented in these tables since they were unable to secure enough cooperation from schools employing their graduates to yield results in any quantity. Bradley University had difficulty at this point, also, and their results in Table 3 are based on only three returns. Determinations of statistical significance in Table 3, therefore, were made only on the data of North Central College and the University of Illinois.

Examination of results from first-year teachers in Table 3 reveals that there was a statistically significant difference,

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL DATA OF ENGLISH MAJORS ENTERING TEACHING

	Illinois		NCC		Loyola		Bradley	
	Class of 68 (16)	Class of 69*(10)	Class of 68 (17)	Class of 69*(8)	Class of 68 (18)	Class of 69*(14)	Class of 68 (10)	Class of 69*(15)
High School Class Rank	84.6%	92.2%	82.6%	91.6%	84.8%	74.0%	80.8%	69.0%
ETS Score	635	637	620.6	674	653	608	---	606.2
MTAI	46	61.6	31.5	46.2	47.9	51.9	36.0	39.6
Watson Glaser	77.1	80.2	76.4	76.9	77.3	79.0	73.0	77.4
College Grade Point Average**	2.95	3.12	2.98	2.78	2.91	2.71	2.81	2.53
English Grade Point Average**	2.97	3.13	3.07	2.95	2.81	2.90	2.78	2.84
Average Number English Credits	33.2	30.6	39.5	33.6	34.5	33.6	37.8	39.0

* Statistics for the class of '69 are based upon 7 semesters of college work.
** Grade point averages are based on 4.00 for an A.

TABLE 2

APPRAISAL OF TEACHER COMPETENCE IN THE AREA OF LITERATURE*

Appraisal of Practice Teachers

	Ill	NCC	Brad	Sig.
KNOWLEDGE OF:				
1. Major works of English and American authors	2.91	2.88	2.83	NS
2. Major genre	3.41	3.24	3.11	NS
3. Major literary movements	2.50	2.77	2.44	NS
4. Historical developments	3.32	3.69	3.00	.01
5. Source materials	2.95	2.94	2.11	.01
6. World literature	2.59	2.73	2.44	NS
7. Literature for various ages	2.95	2.76	2.89	NS
8. Critical theories	2.95	3.14	2.78	NS
9. Contemporary literature	3.09	2.67	2.67	NS
ABILITY TO:				
10. Adjust materials to the student's needs	3.59	3.41	2.61	.01
11. Use a variety of sources	3.36	2.88	2.39	.01
12. Relate literature to other subjects	2.68	2.76	2.11	.01
13. Utilize a variety of teaching methods	3.41	3.12	2.83	.01
14. Create a stimulating classroom climate	3.45	3.00	2.78	.01
15. Achieve a unified approach	3.63	3.47	3.61	NS
STUDENT RESPONSE TO TEACHER:				
16. Readiness for further learning	3.14	3.00	2.50	.01
17. Stimulation to creative thinking	3.23	2.76	2.89	.01

*This appraisal form appears in Appendix B.
Ratings are based on a 1-4 scale. A rating of 4 is superior.

TABLE 3

APPRAISAL OF TEACHER COMPETENCE IN THE AREA OF LITERATURE*

Appraisal of First-Year Teachers

	Ill	NCC	Brad	Sig.
KNOWLEDGE OF:				
1. Major works of English and American authors	2.80	3.10	3.00	NS
2. Major genre	3.30	3.45	3.33	NS
3. Major literary movements	2.60	2.67	3.00	NS
4. Historical developments	3.00	3.60	3.33	.01
5. Source materials	2.80	3.45	3.33	.01
6. World literature	2.30	2.90	2.67	.01
7. Literature for various ages	2.80	3.00	3.00	NS
8. Critical theories	2.40	3.11	2.33	.01
9. Contemporary literature	2.70	2.70	2.33	NS
ABILITY TO:				
10. Adjust materials to the student's needs	3.00	3.45	2.67	NS
11. Use a variety of sources	2.20	2.82	2.67	.01
12. Relate literature to other subjects	2.60	3.37	2.67	.01
13. Utilize a variety of teaching methods	3.10	3.37	2.67	NS
14. Create a stimulating classroom climate	2.80	3.73	2.80	.01
15. Achieve a unified approach	3.40	4.00	4.00	.01
STUDENT RESPONSE TO TEACHER:				
16. Readiness for further learning	2.50	3.09	3.00	.01
17. Stimulation to creative thinking	2.80	3.18	2.67	NS

*This appraisal form appears in Appendix B.
Ratings are based on a 1-4 scale. A rating of 4 is superior.

as measured by t-tests, between the North Central College genre approach and the University of Illinois survey approach on nine items. In each case the difference was in favor of the genre approach at the .01 level. Examination of results from student teachers reported in Table 2 reveals that there were again statistically significant results, at the .01 level, on nine items of the appraisal, although not the same nine items. The differences were not so clearly in favor of the genre approach, although, in five of the nine items they were. In general, the North Central College genre and the University of Illinois survey approaches seemed to be more effective in preparing prospective teachers than was the Bradley University historical-period approach. Reference to Table 1, however, indicates that the sample from Bradley University in this year might not have been as representative as usual, and this could have affected the results adversely as far as Bradley was concerned. Differences of more than .6 of a point in rating between any two schools were significant at the .01 level.

Tables 4 and 5 record the results of the appraisals that the student teachers and the first-year teachers made of the preparation for teaching obtained at the various schools they attended. Numbers were somewhat smaller and the results, therefore, less indicative of the implications for testing of the hypothesis of the study. However, on 16 items of the appraisal, first-year teachers saw their preparation under one or another of the curricular patterns as significantly more effective than did first-year teachers trained under other patterns. In general, a difference of .4 between any two schools was significant at the .01 level. The pattern of effectiveness was not as clearly defined as was the pattern when teachers were appraised by their critic teachers or by their department heads.

Results from student teachers appraising their preparation for teaching in the light of their teaching experience, Table 4, were examined, and only five items failed to indicate significant differences at the .01 level. Again, a .4 difference in rating between any two schools was significant, and no special pattern of superiority for any one curricular pattern was readily apparent.

TABLE 4

SELF-APPRAISAL OF TEACHER PREPARATION
IN THE AREA OF LITERATURE*

Appraisal By Practice Teachers

ABILITY TO:	Ill	NCC	Brad	Sig.
1. Teach poetry	3.56	4.14	3.22	.01
2. Relate literature to historical periods in which it was written	3.19	2.71	3.14	.01
3. Relate literature and life	4.50	3.86	4.07	.01
4. Deal with philosophical premises underlying the literature	3.38	3.00	3.07	.01
5. Teach the novel	3.56	3.86	3.14	.01
6. Deal with psychological premises underlying the literature	4.00	2.86	3.22	.01
7. Communicate own concern for literature to students	4.06	4.00	3.79	NS
8. Teach the essay	2.74	2.00	4.72	.01
9. Assign and handle book reports	4.00	2.71	2.57	.01
10. Locate and utilize literary materials other than textbooks	4.19	4.00	3.50	.01
11. Critically evaluate the textbooks	3.50	3.71	4.72	.01
12. Teach the short story	4.25	3.29	4.72	.01
13. Suggest or advise on new texts and materials	3.31	2.43	3.36	.01
14. Adapt materials to students	3.44	3.14	3.50	.01
15. Adapt assignments to students	3.69	3.29	3.36	.01
16. Teach drama	3.31	3.14	2.79	.01
17. Communicate with other teachers	3.62	3.43	2.93	.01
18. Utilize techniques other than lecture	4.38	3.71	3.78	.01
19. Organize materials for coherent presentation over period of weeks	4.06	3.43	4.72	NS
20. Teach biography	3.00	2.86	2.86	NS
21. Arouse interest in literature generally	3.81	3.71	3.57	NS
22. Relate literature to other subjects	3.19	3.43	3.43	NS
23. Teach non-fiction	2.75	2.57	2.92	.01
24. Arouse new ideas in students	3.62	2.86	3.35	.01
25. Arouse interest in literature from other countries	3.88	3.29	3.50	.01
26. Arouse creative talents in students	3.75	3.29	3.29	.01

*This appraisal form appears in Appendix C.
Ratings are based on a 1-5 scale. A rating of 5 is excellent.
A rating of 3 is considered average.

TABLE 5

SELF-APPRAISAL OF TEACHER PREPARATION
IN THE AREA OF LITERATURE*

Appraisal By First-Year Teachers

ABILITY TO:	Ill	NCC	Brad	Sig.
1. Teach poetry	3.50	4.22	3.67	.01
2. Relate literature to historical periods in which it was written	3.00	4.00	3.44	.01
3. Relate literature and life	4.20	3.72	3.89	.01
4. Deal with philosophical premises underlying the literature	3.50	3.93	3.22	.01
5. Teach the novel	3.80	3.72	2.89	.01
6. Deal with psychological premises underlying the literature	3.30	3.57	3.22	NS
7. Communicate own concern for literature to students	4.00	3.93	3.56	.01
8. Teach the essay	3.10	2.50	1.89	.01
9. Assign and handle book reports	3.60	3.29	2.56	.01
10. Locate and utilize literary materials other than textbooks	3.80	3.64	3.56	NS
11. Critically evaluate the textbooks	3.00	3.64	4.00	.01
12. Teach the short story	3.90	3.57	3.11	.01
13. Suggest or advise on new texts and materials	3.30	2.86	3.33	.01
14. Adapt materials to students	3.30	3.50	2.89	.01
15. Adapt assignments to students	3.60	3.36	2.89	.01
16. Teach drama	2.70	3.56	2.67	.01
17. Communicate with other teachers	4.20	4.14	4.00	NS
18. Utilize techniques other than lecture	4.10	3.29	4.11	.01
19. Organize materials for coherent presentation over period of weeks	3.60	3.29	3.22	.01
20. Teach biography	2.70	2.14	2.89	.01
21. Arouse interest in literature generally	3.50	3.29	3.56	NS
22. Relate literature to other subjects	3.50	3.93	3.89	.01
23. Teach non-fiction	2.90	2.71	2.89	NS
24. Arouse new ideas in students	3.20	3.43	3.22	NS
25. Arouse interest in literature from other countries	2.90	3.57	3.44	.01
26. Arouse creative talents in students	3.20	3.50	3.33	NS

*This appraisal form appears in Appendix C.
Ratings are based on a 1-5 scale. A rating of 5 is excellent.
A rating of 3 is considered average.

DISCUSSION

Despite the rather small size of the population in this study, the results seemed to indicate the value of securing this type of information to throw light upon problems of curriculum. There were obvious difficulties in the securing of statistics. It was discovered early in the course of the program that the various items of information derived were probably too numerous, and the results indicated rather limited usefulness of many of the items recorded as well. For example, the ambitious design of comparing ETS scores from the beginning of the sophomore year with scores on the same test obtained at the end of the senior year promised good results, but in the final analysis there were only a few students at all of the schools involved for whom this information was obtained--far too few to be useful. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the Watson-Glaser Test of Critical Thinking similarly promised useful results but were somewhat "spotty" in final compilations and difficult to relate in a meaningful way to the other statistics obtained.

Overall grade point and English grade point averages, hours of English, high school ranks, and board scores were readily available data, of course. Beyond indicating, however, the high quality of students at the cooperating institutions, it was difficult to relate these statistics to the basic concern of the study--the effect of curricular patterns in literature upon teacher effectiveness in teaching literature. An analysis of variance or covariance might have revealed some relationships, but the small size of the population would have been so reduced by such procedures that that sort of analysis was not attempted.

What did appear, when teacher effectiveness in literature in the classroom was evaluated by other teachers or by department chairmen, was a statistical superiority for a curriculum based upon a genre approach. Interestingly and somewhat inexplicably, this statistical superiority was not found with respect to items 2 and 3 of the teacher appraisal, knowledge of major genres or knowledge of literary movements, but did appear in item 4, knowledge of historical developments.

While the numbers involved were small, the indicated statistical significance of both genre and survey to the historical period approach as appraised by supervisors of student teachers seemed to bear out the contention of Wellek and Warren, that literature has its own raison d'etre and that historical approaches are perhaps not as relevant as those dealing more specifically with literature as literature.

Results of the self-appraisal completed by student teachers and by first-year teachers were difficult to interpret. The greater variation in the appraisals by student teachers than in those by teachers with a year's experience in the schools indicates perhaps the greater reliability of the latter statistics. However, no consistent pattern of support for any one curricular approach as superior to the others appeared in either tabulation of appraisals. It was apparent that with all three approaches, as evidenced by scores on items 8, 20, and 23, student teachers as well as first-year teachers felt some inability to handle materials of the intellectual prose nature--essay, biography, non-fiction.

It was also apparent that student teachers and first-year teachers prepared under a genre curriculum did not necessarily feel they were better prepared to teach a particular genre than were their counterparts who were prepared under the other types of curricula (items 1, 5, 8, 12, 16, 20, 23). This correlates with the judgment of those observing teachers as recorded in items 1, 2, and 3 of Tables 2 and 3.

Many other possible comparisons of the statistical results might be made, but these, on the whole, are speculative and invite further examination by the schools involved and others curious as to the why of the many changes which appeared when a student teacher got into an actual teaching situation.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

It appeared, on the basis of the results as reported here, that the null hypothesis with which this study was concerned was rejected. It seemed that a particular curricular pattern did make a difference in the effectiveness of teachers of literature in the classroom as appraised by department chairmen and supervising or critic teachers. It would, however, be presumptuous on the basis of the statistics secured for this report to pontificate in any fashion. Whether the results were due only to curricular patterns could not be ascertained, and probably such a finding would be impossible to ever secure in any totally definitive way. There is some statistical support, however, for the contention that the traditional, and probably most widely used patterns for curriculum in English departments--historical and survey arrangements--are not the only way English may be taught to prepare good classroom teachers of literature. In fact, they may be, if the results of this study have any significance at all, less effective than a genre arrangement of the curriculum which deals with literature as an entity in itself which may be studied in terms of its various forms; i.e., poetry, drama, novel, and intellectual prose.

For further study it would seem that continuation of this sort of survey of results of preparation upon teacher effectiveness is indicated, for the schools involved and for others who are concerned about the kind of job they are doing in teacher preparation. The instruments of measurement developed for the study were perhaps inadequate, and reliance upon subjective factors of observation obviously has some flaws. However, the results reported herein were sufficiently significant to bear consideration and serious study before departments of English or English education continue to present curricular arrangements under the assumption that they are the best way to prepare teachers of literature. Certainly it should be possible for any concerned English or education department to secure appraisals from critic teachers and student teachers as a part of the teacher preparation program of the college. This level of cooperation could easily be attained and could furnish a fairly reliable base for study of the effectiveness of various programs for preparing teachers of literature for the schools.

It is to be hoped that programs such as the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers may continue in the future, enabling English and education departments to experiment, to challenge "sacred cows," and to foster innovation.

References may be identified by the superscript cited in the body of the report.

REFERENCES

1. (8) Crane, R. S. "History versus Criticism in the University Study of Literature," English Journal (College edition), XXIV (1935), 645-667.

2. (3) Lewis, John S. and Jean C. Sisk. Teaching English 7-12. (4) New York: American Book Company, 1963.

3. (2) Pearce, Roy Harvey, "Literature, History, and Humanism," College English. (February, 1963), 24:364-372.

4. (1) Peterson, Erling W. "A Study of the Effect Upon the Teaching Effectiveness of English Teachers of the Reorganization of the Literature Component of a Teacher Training Curriculum." USOE Project Number HE-145. USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029. ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-13-5-65. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Research. October, 1967.

5. (5) Rosenblatt, Louise. Literature As Exploration. New York: Appleton Century, 1938.

6. (7) Spiller, Robert. "Is Literary History Obsolete?" College English (February, 1963), 24:345-351.

7. (6) Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942.

APPENDIX A

STUDY RECORD SHEET

Name:

School:

Address:

Employer:

High School (from):

High School Rank	
IQ or	
ACT	
SAT	
ETS #1	
ETS #2	
MTAI	
Watson Glaser	
GRE	
GRE L and L	
College Class Rank	
Overall Grade Index	
Hrs. of English (incl. Methods)	
English Grade Index	

APPENDIX B

APPRAISAL OF TEACHER COMPETENCE IN THE AREA OF LITERATURE

Position of Person Making This Appraisal:

This appraisal has been developed primarily to determine the teacher's competence in the area of literature. A total score is sought so each category should be marked to the best of the observer's ability. Some questions obviously cannot be marked without observation over some period of time, but, in any case, please give some score in each area. The information will be kept strictly confidential.

1. Knowledge of major works of English and American authors
   __a. narrow range of acquaintance
   __b. knows some major writers and works
   __c. knows many major writers and works
   __d. knows most major writers and works

2. Knowledge of major genre of literature (i.e., novel, poetry, drama, etc.)
   __a. concentrates on one form primarily
   __b. uses two forms principally
   __c. uses all major forms but favors one or two
   __d. is familiar with and uses all forms equally well

3. Knowledge of major literary movements (Romantic, Neo-Classic, etc.)
   __a. knows one movement or period very well and concentrates study and concern there
   __b. knows at least two periods well
   __c. is familiar with most major periods
   __d. knows and uses all major periods with ease

4. Knowledge of historical developments of literature
   __a. sees little connection between history and literature
   __b. is aware of historical changes but makes few connections
   __c. makes historical connections but is not vitally aware of history as a contributing factor in literature
   __d. is at home in history and in literature and can make valid and vital connections

Appraisal of Teacher Competence - 2

5. Knowledge of source materials of literature (i.e., Bible, mythology, folklore, legend, etc.)
   __a. shows little knowledge of backgrounds
   __b. is aware of backgrounds but seldom uses them
   __c. uses backgrounds frequently but is not completely at home with them
   __d. shows rich and varied awareness

6. Knowledge of literature of other countries in translation (world literature)
   __a. little apparent knowledge of writers of other countries
   __b. knows one or two writers of other countries but seldom uses them
   __c. knows several writers of other countries but uses them only infrequently
   __d. knows many writers from other countries and uses them on many occasions

7. Knowledge of a range of literature for various age groups
   __a. is familiar with literature suitable for college rather exclusively
   __b. is familiar mostly with literature suitable for honors or college preparatory classes
   __c. is familiar with literature suitable for general high school work as well as that for honors classes
   __d. is familiar with literature for all ages from fifth or sixth grade to college level.

8. Knowledge of critical theories of literature
   __a. has little or no critical consciousness in dealing with literature
   __b. knows some critical theory but seldom uses it
   __c. knows and applies at least one critical theory
   __d. knows several theories and can apply them readily

9. Knowledge of literature as a current activity
   __a. is unfamiliar with new authors and titles
   __b. knows some contemporary authors and titles but seldom uses them
   __c. knows many contemporary authors and titles and uses them occasionally in class or conversation
   __d. knows contemporary authors and titles so well that he is regarded as a source or center for information on new authors and writings

Appendix B (continued)

Appraisal of Teacher Competence - 3

10. Awareness of different capacities and levels of understanding in his students and ability to adjust his materials to the students
    __a. has one set assignment for all students
    __b. is aware that individual classes may vary in ability and adjusts assignments accordingly
    __c. is aware that individuals within a class may vary in ability but seldom adjusts assignments accordingly
    __d. is aware of class and individual levels of ability and adjusts assignments accordingly

11. Ability to use a variety of sources for classroom materials
    __a. is confined to the textbook assigned
    __b. uses the text and the school library
    __c. uses entire school and community facilities
    __d. stimulates students to find source materials from a variety of places to add to the total resources for the class

12. Ability to relate his subject material to other areas of learning in the school
    __a. seems aware of little or no connection between his subject and any other
    __b. relates his work to other subjects but only rarely
    __c. relates his work readily to other subject areas
    __d. relates his work readily to other subject areas and is able to cooperate and contribute on equal basis with teachers in other subject areas

13. Ability to use a variety of teaching presentations
    __a. relies mostly upon lectures
    __b. uses lecture and some discussion
    __c. uses lecture, discussion and audio visual techniques available in the school
    __d. uses materials and teaching aids available in the school and is creative and ingenious in devising new techniques and materials

14. Ability to create a classroom climate that encourages or stimulates students to become involved in literature
    __a. presents literature primarily as it is in the text
    __b. uses a few maps, pictures, etc., to get students out of the book but does not reveal his own involvement in or stimulation by literature
    __c. reveals his own involvement in and stimulation by literature, but utilizes few external aids
    __d. uses entire classroom and his own total personality to reveal literature as a living experience

Appraisal of Teacher Competence - 4

15. Ability to achieve a unified and relevant approach to a literary work
__a. does not seem to know how to talk about a work, frequently digresses
__b. stresses historical, biographical matters but neglects to talk about the work itself.
__c. concentrates on minute details of the work but does not generalize and unify
__d. arrives at a coherent appreciation of the work itself, illuminating it both by its internal details and its background

16. Student response to the teacher: Readiness for further learning
__a. student is left unaware of any further learning to be accomplished in this field
__b. occasionally student is made aware of this subject in its relation to others and to further matters in the same area
___c. usually alerts students to possibilities for larger knowledge in this area
__d. is able to get students involved and gives them foundations for much wider and deeper learning in this and other areas

17. Student response to the teacher: Stimulation to creative thinking
__a. seems to rely mostly upon memorization of facts and dates
__b. draws students out but not intentionally
__c. has plans and programs which cause students to think for themselves in most assignments
__d. encourages greatly original and reflective thought through assignments and class work

APPENDIX C

TEACHER'S SELF-APPRAISAL OF

COLLEGE PREPARATION IN AREA OF LITERATURE

Name: Teaching at:

Below is presented a variety of statements pertaining to the preparation your college gave you to teach literature. Rate each of the statements from 0 (very poor) to 5 (excellent), with 3 being considered average.

1. __ Ability to teach poetry.
2. __ Ability to relate literature to historical periods in which it was written.
3. __ Ability to show relationships between literature and life.
4. __ Ability to deal with philosophical premises underlying the literature.
5. __ Ability to teach the novel.
6. __ Ability to deal with psychological premises underlying the literature.
7. __ Ability to communicate own concern for literature to students.
8. __ Ability to teach the essay.
9. __ Ability to assign and handle book reports.
10. __ Ability to locate and utilize literary materials other than textbooks.
11. __ Ability to evaluate critically the literature textbooks provided.
12. __ Ability to teach the short story.
13. __ Ability to suggest or advise on new textbooks or materials in literature.
14. __ Ability to adapt literature materials to the pace and abilities of the students.

Appendix C (continued)

Teacher's Self Appraisal - 2

15. __ Ability to adapt literature assignments to students.

16. __ Ability to teach drama.

17. __ Ability to converse and share with other teachers of literature.

18. __ Ability to utilize techniques other than lecture for instruction.

19. __ Ability to organize literature materials coherently for presentation to class over a period of weeks.

20. __ Ability to teach biography.

21. __ Ability to arouse interest in literature generally.

22. __ Ability to relate literature to other subjects taught in the school.

23. __ Ability to teach non-fiction.

24. __ Ability to arouse new ideas in students.

25. __ Ability to arouse interest in literature other than American.

26. __ Ability to arouse creative talents in students.